



**Shoreline Alternative Mitigation Plan
Public Open House, May 22, 2006
Summary of Comments**

General Questions and Answers

1. How were unit values calculated?

Answer: Using a method developed by federal agencies called Habitat Equivalency Procedures. Process will undergo peer review by qualified scientists prior to implementation.

2. Count of Chinook going through study area? Mortality?

Answer: That would be useful information to have and several agencies are looking to develop that information. Mortality studies, however, are outside the scope of the SAMP in that this plan focuses on mitigation requirements of project applicants. Future mitigation may be informed by studies of mortality and what is effective, but can not be a part of this plan because of limits on the kind of mitigation that can be required of applicants.

3. Should monitor fish survival as measure of success.

Answer: See above.

4. Is SAMP a fait accompli? What could change?

Answer: SAMP is not a fait accompli and will probably require action by the City Council to become effective. Workshops such as this one are important to shaping the plan.

5. Why not include Union Bay?

Answer: We were advised by scientists that there was a greater equivalency of shorelines in the selected study area.

6. Should off-site mitigation be localized?

Answer: At this point it is assumed that mitigation for projects in the study area can occur anywhere within the study area and achieve equivalency. This assumption will also be validated by outside scientific review.

7. What is the driver behind the project?

Answer: The goal of this project is to develop a timelier and predictable permitting process for water-dependent industrial uses which are an important part of the City's economic base, and to achieve better and more effective mitigation.

Participant Comments

1. There should be a "Re-opener" clause in case offsite mitigation doesn't take.
2. Monitor/maintenance of 5-10 years, who is responsible after that?
3. Need to control costs of mitigation? If it is too expensive, no one will participate?
4. No one will remove marina and replace with cat tails.
5. Applicants won't purchase off-site property?
6. Ratio of 1.3:1 does not address cost of money at any given time or City overhead.
7. It is difficult to see the relationship between factors (e.g. armoring vs. vegetation)
8. Appreciates focus of mitigation on habitat.
9. Concern that focus is on public land. If mitigation occurs only on public land then there will be a net loss of ecological function.
10. Ratio of offsite mitigation to project impact should be higher.

- 11.** Break study area into at least 3 sub areas and limit mitigation within each sub area to projects from that sub area.
- 12.** Need staff to monitor restoration & re-evaluate after 10 years.
- 13.** Use of the City's CIP plan to determine if public property will be restored without SAMP is inadequate. Before restoring publicly held property through SAMP, a longer view needs to be taken for the potential of restoration through other resources to avoid a net loss of ecological function.
- 14.** Big picture vision for area (include info regarding global warming). Need to look at long-term changes to lake.
- 15.** Plan looks good for on-site mitigation, but more questions come up off-site (and land costs).
- 16.** Should not include public land in offsite mitigation projects.
- 17.** Is there a scientific reason for not mitigating outside Lake Union?
- 18.** Using this system for on-site only will create only small, scattered improvements.
- 19.** Public land could be used in some cases.
- 20.** Portage Bay project could be mitigated in Union Bay.